



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The most interesting and instructive parts of the book treat mainly of Greek lands outside the beaten track of 'personally conducted' parties. The chapters on the various Ionian Islands and on the Maniats of southern Laconia are cases in point.

Father Quinn shows great interest, insight and fairness in his treatment of religious questions. The 'survivals' of ancient myth and ritual are continually indicated.

The brief but vivid account of the siege of Mesolonghi in the Greek Revolution is far superior in interest to the annalistic narrative of Howe, or to the scholarly but prosaic account of Finlay. It rather recalls the story of the novelist Xenos in his 'Andronike', translated by Grosvenor.

The most serious criticism to be passed upon Dr. Quinn's book grows out of his familiarity with the modern Greek pronunciation and his fondness for that pronunciation. This is a matter of the personal equation, of course, and it is within an author's technical right to use what are, to the readers to whom the book appeals, outlandish and repellent expressions, but *cui bono*?

In the first place, such a scheme is almost impossible of consistent execution, as Dr. Quinn's book abundantly proves. *Eu* in Greek names he regularly writes *ev*, thus giving us *Zeus*, *Elevisis*, *Peiraecevs*, and even *Akrokeraevnian*, the last being an Anglicized form of a Latinized Greek word. Will Dr. Quinn tell us that this spelling represents any actual pronunciation of the English word at any period? Possibly *Elevisis* represents a some-time truth, but why not go to the length and use *Levsina* as the Greeks of today do? If we insist upon *Peiraecevs*, why not transliterate exactly and write *Peiraievs*? Dr. Quinn writes *Bathy* and *Bolos*, but *Omer Vrioni*; why not *V* in all if we are to indicate the modern sounds? *Phaeaks* (not *Phaiaks*) for our old friends the Phaeacians, *Evmolpids*, *Levktra*, all raise our ire, for they simply introduce a new element of confusion into the already sufficiently perplexing question of spelling and pronunciation. Many of these words are thoroughly Anglicized, and no one, it seems to us, is justified in thus making a bad matter worse. And if bad for the Greek student who can "see the point", how much worse for the non-Greek reader who needs a glossary of Quinnisms to get him back into his former world.

But this is Father Quinn's little fad, and we gladly forgive him for it, in view of the instruction and pleasure he has given us in Helladian Vistas.

GEORGE A. WILLIAMS.

KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN.

CORRESPONDENCE

In sending you a brief rejoinder to Professor Greene's reply to my criticism of his paper upon Latin Word-Order, I would not occupy the position

of the proverbial woman who must have the last word, but I want to express regret for my slip in not noticing that *fiebat* and not *factus est* stands in the passage from Cicero's Milo, though, as Professor Greene suggests, the blunder does not invalidate my argument.

Will you spare me space for another remark or two? What Professor Greene says about the position of "the stronger or more significant word" seems to show that we mean different things by the term 'emphasis'. According to him these more significant words are *eo ipso* the more emphatic ones, while I hold that emphasis is quite independent of the connotative force of a word.

Again, Professor Greene says truly that 'we must note carefully the Latin form of expression'. It is on this account that it seems to me futile to try to settle any question of emphasis in Latin by setting before elocutionists unfamiliar with that language a literal translation of a Latin sentence. This might work if one could reproduce in English all the shadings of the thought in Latin sentences as well as one generally can those of the thought expressed in German or French or other modern languages, by translating nouns by nouns, verbs by verbs, adjectives by adjectives, etc. To deny emphasis to a Latin word because one would not emphasize its syntactical equivalent in an English sentence translated word for word from the Latin appears to me entirely unwarrantable.

I should like to show how such crude indications of emphasis as 'I *am passing* my FOUR and eightieth year', and 'But I *come* to the farmers, etc.', do not at all express the very slight degrees of emphasis which a Greenoughite sees in such sentences, but it would take too long, and your readers are doubtless weary of the subject already. I hope they will all read Professor Meader's article in The School Review for April.

NOTE

HORACE'S ESTIMATE OF HELIODORUS IN SERM. 1. 5. 3.

rhetor comes Heliodorus
Graecorum longe doctissimus.

The individual alluded to probably cannot now be identified. "The hyperbole is intended and is playful", comments Wickham. "Probably a friendly overestimate, as no account of him has come down to us with all his learning", observes Greenough. "An exaggerated expression characteristic of the mock-heroic style which Horace adopts in several parts of this satire, . . . a form of wit common in modern times", writes Rolfe. Among the multitude of similar comments on this passage, we may be surprised that what seems an obvious explanation is not emphasized, that Horace is speaking in bitter

irony, as one who, while suffering from dyspepsia, has probably been bored to extinction by a garrulous pedant. The Greek erudition of Heliodorus was a sorry *passé-temps* for the youthful poet, who doubtless wished himself out of such company and back in Rome. The estimate is no more serious than the following from a later period. Fronto (Ep. ad Amicos 1. 7; see Naber p. 140), in recommending on hearsay testimony as a teacher Antoninus Aquila, vir doctus et facundus, closes his letter with the quip: ego vero etiam nomine hominis faveo ut sit ῥητόρων ἀριστος, quoniam quidem Aquila appellatur.

There is no reason to suppose that Heliodorus was a member of the 'junker' to Brundisium. That *longe doctissimus* is playfully characterizing is a possible assumption, yet it would seem that Horace could hardly have been in a very playful mood. Scheiden thut Weh! Departure from Rome came hard. The main party was to be met further on. The big capital with its lavish hospitality would be missed in the humble road-house in the little village of Aricia. Horace doubtless knew the oft-quoted sententia of Publilius Syrus, that *comes facundus in via pro vehiculo*, and cursed the amiable volubility of the pedant on the Via Appia as heartily as he did the officiousness of the light o' tongue on the Via Sacra (Serm. 1. 9). At Forum Appi he had to rub shoulders with the brutal bargemen and fleecing inn keepers. The travelers were disinclined to hasten, the road was rough. The water was bad; Horace was sick. There does not seem much likelihood that Horace at this stage was in a cheerful mood; it seems less likely that looking back on his journey, as he writes this satire, he would inject a bit of pleasantry; irony rather would suit his mood.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

THE CESNOLA COLLECTION

We give, in slightly condensed form, the article on this subject by John M. Myres, in the September number of the Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

The further progress which has now been made with the examination and rearrangement of the Cesnola Collection of Cypriote Antiquities permits a general forecast of the results.

First, as to selection and arrangement of exhibits. The very large size of the collection has always made it impossible to expose all the objects for general study. It has therefore been decided to separate the collection into two parts, one of which, consisting of the finest specimens of each kind of workmanship, will be treated as a series of typical examples, and retained on view in the present gallery on the ground floor of the Museum; while the other, which will contain the many large series of objects of almost monotonous similarity, will be transferred to a less public gallery, easily accessible from the

former, and more convenient for the special purposes of expert students.

The series of typical vases which has been selected for exhibition consists of about 2,000 examples. It will occupy the whole of the seventy-eight wall cases of the west and south walls of the gallery, together with eight large floor cases. In the latter are collected a small number of the largest and most important vases of each successive style; and by this means it is possible to do justice to the fine groups of Mycenaean and Orientalizing vases, in which the collection is so rich.

A similar range of cases on the east wall of the gallery and on the walls of the northern annex, is assigned to the Type series of Cypriote sculpture, which is supplemented in the same way as the vases, by floor cases containing the larger heads and busts, and a selection of the largest terra-cotta heads. The life-size statues which formerly filled the middle of the Cypriote Gallery, will in future be redistributed in three groups, round the central piers, and considerably reduced in number, corresponding provision being made in the Students' Collection downstairs for the statues withdrawn from above. The great sarcophagi and sculptured tombs and tombstones will in future be grouped together in the northern annex of the same gallery, under more favorable conditions of light and space than has been possible hitherto.

All the sculpture and most of the painted vases have been found on examination to need thorough and careful cleaning. It was already known that many objects had required and received minor repairs before they could be put on exhibition at all; and care has been taken to determine exactly in the process of cleaning the precise extent of these repairs. In general, however, it may be repeated already, that the appearance of the statues is very little affected by the process. The chief changes in their aspect are due to the recovery of the mellow cream-colored tones of the soft native limestone of which the statues are made; and to the discovery, in many instances, of clear and even copious traces of their original coloring. One of the most notable pieces in the collection, for example, the well-known 'Priest with the Dove', is found to have many marks of red borders and designs on the drapery, besides decoration in red, black, and yellow on the helmet, and traces of red color on the lips. Some of the Orientalizing statues were also brightly colored originally, and the same practice persisted in the Cypriote art of the fifth and fourth centuries, and perhaps even later still.

The preparation of a general guide to the whole collection has been greatly facilitated by the detailed studies of which a summary has been given above; and it is hoped that it may be possible to make this guide public not long after the reopening of the collection itself to the public.

JOHN L. MYRES.